



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,240	04/13/2006	Masamichi Nogami	285366US2PCT	3473
22850	7590	02/10/2009		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER YAM, STEPHEN K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2878	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/10/2009	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/566,240	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NOGAMI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> STEPHEN YAM	<b>Art Unit</b> 2878	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) STEPHEN YAM. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Joseph Wrkich. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 03 February 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 6.

Identification of prior art discussed: Yanagisawa JP 2000-315923.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner and Applicant discussed the Yanagisawa reference and the differences between Yanigisawa and Applicant's invention. Applicant explained the features of Applicant's invention. Examiner and Applicant discussed possible language which would clarify the claimed invention and emphasize the differences between Yanigisawa and Applicant's claimed invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Stephen Yam/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2878	
--------------------------------------------------	--